

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 268

FL 010 546

AUTHOR Perry, William
TITLE Systematic Learning of the English Negation System by a Native Speaker of Polish.
PUB DATE Oct 78
NOTE 24p.; M.A. Thesis, University of Minnesota
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Contrastive Linguistics; *English (Second Language); Error Analysis (Language); Grammar; Interference (Language Learning); Language Development; *Language Instruction; Language Research; *Learning Processes; *Negative Forms (Language); *Polish; *Second Language Learning

ABSTRACT

The English speech of an adult native Polish speaker learning English as a second language was analyzed for the acquisition of the English negation system. The types of errors made appeared to be developmental rather than language transfer errors. There was little trouble with single negation in English which contrasts with multiple negation in Polish. The learner's chief difficulty was his consistent use of "don't" regardless of grammatical person, number, or time reference. The learner's negation system appeared to be developing much like a child's first language system. "Not" was consistently contracted with forms of "do" and never with forms of "be." In order to facilitate more rapid acquisition of the English negation system by adult learners, it is suggested that the classroom teacher focus the learner's attention on the particle "not" as an optionally contractible part of the negative element. This approach provides the learner with a sense of underlying uniformity in the English negation system. (Author/JB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

SYSTEMATIC LEARNING OF THE ENGLISH NEGATION SYSTEM BY

A NATIVE SPEAKER OF POLISH ¹

© William Perry ²

University of Minnesota

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William S. Perry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED175268

This paper focuses on the learning of the negation system in English by a native speaker of Polish. The types of errors made appear to be developmental rather than language transfer errors. There is little trouble with single negation in English which contrasts with multiple negation in Polish. The learner's major difficulty is his consistent use of the form don't regardless of grammatical person, number or time reference. The learner's negation system appears to be developing in much the same way that the child's L₁ system develops. Not is consistently contracted with forms of do and never contracted with any form of be. This usage corresponds very closely to that of children acquiring English as a first language. Although this learner shows considerable sophistication in other areas of syntax and has a fairly extensive vocabulary, his negation system is at approximately the same level of sophistication as that of a three year-old child learning English. In order to facilitate more rapid acquisition of the English negation system by adult learners, it is suggested that the classroom teacher focus the learner's attention on the particle not as an optionally contractible part of the negative element. This approach provides the learner with a sense of the underlying uniformity in the English negation system.

1

This paper was written in partial fulfillment of the M.A. thesis requirements in the Program in English as a Second Language at the University of Minnesota, October, 1978.

2

I would like to thank Betty W. Robinett, Michael P. Maratsos, Leonard A. Polakiewicz and Frank Wesley for their help with this paper.

Through an analysis of errors, distributional patterns, and avoidance tendencies in a native speaker of Polish's negation system in English, a systematic learning strategy was discovered. This strategy does not seem to be related solely to the learner's native language, nor does his usage appear to reflect the English that he is exposed to in his everyday life. The data show that the learner has analyzed do + NEG separately from be + NEG, and that the form don't is consistently used regardless of person or tense. He always contracts do + NEG to don't and never contracts not with any form of be.¹ This systematic usage is essentially the same as that observed in children acquiring the negation system in English. Since this L₂ learner shows advanced lexical and syntactic competence in other areas, it would be highly desirable to shorten, if possible, the drawn out developmental sequence in his acquisition of the adult negation system. If the L₂ learner's problems with negation can be clearly isolated as developmental in nature, appropriate steps can be taken to teach the productive adult model of distribution and contraction in negation.

After a brief description of the negation systems in Polish and English, I intend to address the following questions:

- (1) Can various types of difficulty for second language learners in the negation system of English be predicted?
- (2) If the difficulties are predictable, are they predictable on the basis of language transfer or on the basis of development within the target language?
- (3) Does the input from the target language environment have any influence on the development of the negation system in English?
- (4) Are some aspects of negation easier to learn because of language universals?
- (5) What steps can be taken by a teacher to help the learner overcome this learning problem?

The types of negation to be covered in this analysis include overt grammatical negation ((no.) AUX + not(n't)) and lexical negation(nobody, nothing, none, etc.). Inferred negation and lexical items which imply negation (fail, unfriendly, incomplete) will not be included. By isolating the exponents of negation in both Polish and English, it is hoped that learner problems can be predicted in a systematic manner.

The corresponding forms for negation in Polish and English are:

<u>English</u>	<u>Polish</u>
no (absolute negation)	nie
not/n't	nie
no (determiner/adverb)	żaden
none	żaden
no one	nikt
nobody	nikt
nothing	nic
nowhere	nigdzie
never	nigdy
neither	ani
nor	ani

Although the surface form similarities are certainly one aspect of difficulty in learning negation in English, actual usage of the forms appears to be the primary source of difficulty. Sentential negation in English requires the use of an auxiliary plus the negative particle not/n't. This is accomplished in Polish by inserting the particle nie in front of the finite verb form. In both languages, this particle can become a phonological part of the verb form. Polish, however, does not have auxiliary verbs except in the imperfective future tense (Cygan, p.300). Since the negative particle in English, especially when contracted, is attached to the auxiliary, this is an area of potential difficulty for the Pole learning English.

In an article on negation in Polish and English, Cygan(1973) separates the use of the negative particle not/n't into two primary categories in order

to facilitate comparison with Polish. The first category includes the auxiliaries do, be, have, will and shall in their roles as operators in English. Do is used this way in certain interrogatives and negative constructions, be in continuous verb forms and in the passive, have as an auxiliary in perfect tenses and shall/will as future markers. These auxiliaries do not carry their own lexical meanings. The second category includes auxiliaries which have their own meanings. This includes the use of be as a copula and in reference to existence of something, have when it refers to possession, and all of the modals with their respective meanings.

In Polish the negative particle precedes the finite form of the verb: nie + V (finite). The following examples illustrate the difference between Polish and English in the first category:

(they) don't like = nie lubią
 (he) won't notice = nie zauważy
 (Cygan, p.304)

The second category of auxiliaries is expressed differently in Polish. The negative particle is followed by a meaning-carrying form similar to the modals and have and be in English:

you're not = nie jesteś
 (they) can't climb downwards = nie mogą zlaźić
 one mustn't complain = nie mogą narzekać
 (Cygan, p.304)

There are some special uses of be and have which could also cause some difficulty for the Polish learner of English. The present tense negated form in English be + NEG is rendered in Polish by nie jestem, and the deletion of jestem is optional in the present tense only. There isn't and there aren't are both nie ma in Polish, and the same item, nie ma, is also used for hasn't and haven't.

It is also important to consider the special formation of words for negation in English like don't, won't and can't in which the negative seems to be an inseparable part of the word. Of these forms, don't, doesn't and didn't can be seen as pure negatives since they have no independent meaning (Cygan, p.302). The various forms of do + NEG are the most frequent in English since all non-auxiliary finite verbs are made negative by the use of the auxiliary do.

The other realizations of negation by the use of negative lexical items can be combined into a group of what Cygan calls 'quantitative negatives,' (p.307). These include the determiners, adverbs and pronouns enumerated above. Sentences in standard English permit only one negative formant per main verb (special cases aside), (Klima and Ballugi, p.338). In Polish, however, if a quantitative negative is used there are usually at least two exponents of negation (Cygan, p.309). In English where words like any or ever would be used after an initial negative formant, Polish would use multiple negation.

Negative sentences in English like 'There was no wind' are usually rendered in Polish by negating the verb and omitting the Polish equivalent of no as a determiner, żaden: 'Nie było wiatru,' (Cygan, p.309). If żaden is used, it must have the appropriate case and gender form. It should be mentioned at this point that all objects of negated verbs in Polish take the genitive case. The English none which is equated with żaden above, can also be rendered by nikt and ani jeden. These differences are mainly in spoken Polish (Cygan, p.310).

The pronouns nobody and nothing have the equivalents nikt and nic in Polish. These pronouns have to be used in appropriate case forms:

<u>Nominative</u>	nikt	nic
<u>Accusative</u>	nikogo	nic
<u>Genitive</u>	nikogo	niczego
<u>Dative</u>	nikomu	niczemu
<u>Instrumental/Locative</u>	nikim	niczym

The negative adverb nowhere has different forms in Polish depending on whether it is used with a verb of motion or a prepositional phrase. If a verb of motion is used, the appropriate form is donikad. Nowhere in a prepositional phrase is rendered by do niczego and in all other uses by nigdzie. The most common Polish form for never is nigdy, but nie is used in sentences like 'You never told me!' (Cygan, p.311). The English negative conjunctions neither and nor are both rendered in Polish by ani. This conjunction ani must be repeated with each item that is joined in the negative construction, and it also possible to place an additional ani in front of the first element in the series:

Polish: nie (ani) X, ani X, ani X, ...

English: neither X, (nor) X, ..., nor X

In English there are two ways to express quantitative negation. The forms no/none can be rendered by not any, no one by not anybody, never by not ever, etc. There^{are} various theories which predict which form is appropriate for a given structure, but, for my purposes, only the distribution of the negative formants will be considered. Klima and Bellugi (1966) point out that there is a specified order for negative formants and that the first expression carries the negative element:

Nobody left anything.
*Anybody left nothing.

(p.338)

Polish does not have the same order or frequency requirements that English does. In Polish, negative particles are attached to every word which can take them in a negative construction. The particle ni- is felt to be a more emphatic negative element than nie which negates the verb. For this reason,

the ni- forms often precede the actual negation of the verb:

Nikt mnie nigdy o niczym nie zawiadamia.
'Nobody keeps me informed.'

(Cygan, p.313)

On the basis of his contrastive study of negation in Polish and English, Cygan is able to predict where a Polish learner of English is likely to have difficulty or relative ease with the negation system. He predicts that the form nie in Polish, equivalent to no and not, would cause confusion in absolute and sentential negation in English. The concept of single negation would also be difficult for the Pole. He predicts that the Polish learner would have difficulty learning to use the auxiliary verbs in the first category above, especially in short answers which don't require repetition of the full verb. The required use of the genitive case for objects in negated sentences in Polish should pose no problem for the Polish learner of English. Cygan suggests that the special use of do in negative sentences, especially the form don't, will be particularly easy for the Polish learner since it is somewhat similar to an existing category in Polish:

I go : I don't go. = Ide : Nie ide. (Cygan, p.328)

The existing category in Polish described by Cygan is based on the use of don't as a lexical item which is purely negative in meaning. He further suggests that the negative preceding the verb is 'much more natural to the Polish learner' than the positions of negatives in languages like German and French (Cygan, p.328).

One way to test the predictability of difficulty with the negation system in English for a second language learner would be to construct a hierarchy of difficulty like that suggested by Stockwell and Bowen (1965). In an earlier paper, I examined two possible ways of describing difficulty for learners from native languages which use multiple negation like Polish and Russian in learning English, which has single negation. On the basis of the relative ease Polish speakers seem to have learning single negation in English and the persistent problems native English speakers have at the beginning level with multiple negation in Polish, the following is an appropriate description of the relative learning difficulty:

<u>Polish</u>	→	<u>English</u>	
multiple markers for negation required		single marker for negation required	(coalesced category)
<u>English</u>	→	<u>Polish</u>	
single marker for negation required		multiple markers for negation required	(split category)

The coalesced category should be easier to learn than the split category.

One would predict that do-support in English negation will be difficult to learn since it is a new category for the Polish learner. Do-support for negation is required when there is no item in the corresponding positive sentence which can serve as an operator (Quirk and Greenbaum, p.184).

do-support for negation

<u>Polish</u>	→	<u>English</u>
∅		obligatory

On Stockwell and Bowen's hierarchy, this is the most difficult category.

Use of negation in sentences with various forms of be and the modal auxiliaries would predictably be easier for the native speaker of Polish learning English than do-support for negation is. Polish requires the

placement of the negative particle nie in front of verbs in negative sentences:

- 1) To nie jest gazeta. 'This isn't a newspaper.'

Since the modal auxiliaries and forms of the verb be can carry the particle not in English, and since the particle nie works similarly in Polish except for its position, this should be^a relatively easy category to learn:

<u>Polish</u>	→	<u>English</u>
obligatory		obligatory

The question of whether the native speaker of Polish would be more likely to prefer using the full negative not to the contracted form n't in English can be at least partially predicted by the phonological assimilation of the particle nie to the verb in Polish. "The particle nie and the following verb are accentually a single word. Therefore, when the verb is monosyllabic, nie is stressed and the verb is unstressed." (Schenker, p.14) This suggests that this learner of English might prefer to use the contracted form n't whenever possible because it closely resembles an existing category in his native language.

The above predictions were made in order to draw attention to the areas of learning which might be most difficult. At this point, however, it is not clear that the models account for the actual difficulties experienced by the learner in the English negation system. The following description of the Polish learner's negation system in English shows where the predictions are most useful.

In the data collected on the Polish speaker's negation system in English, there were over 250 negative constructions in which he could have used multiple negation. In these constructions, he used multiple negation only once:

(2)**I don't have nothing against it.

The learner used a wide variety of negative constructions including any, no, ever, never, anymore, anyone, no one, anybody, nobody, anything, and nothing. From this it is clear that he is not avoiding the structure. The model for learning difficulty suggested above accurately describes the acquisition of single negation for learners whose native language uses multiple negation.

The learner's use of do-support for negation shows an overgeneralization of the form don't. He used the form correctly 52 times with first person singular and plural, second person, and third person plural. The forms most frequently used were with first person singular and third person plural. There were no incorrect uses. He did, however, have difficulty with the third person singular verb form doesn't. He used don't for the third person singular negative construction 13 times in 16 constructions. The following are the three uses of doesn't:

- (3) However he good is, doesn't matter.
- (4) Frank Jr., also doesn't fit.
- (5) It doesn't cost me to keep tradition.

The predominant form for third person singular do-support was don't as illustrated in the following examples:

- (6)**If he don't understand, then....
- (7)**He don't agree.
- (8)**Hungary don't like Russians.
- (9)**It don't have a particular meaning.
- (10)**Yugoslavia don't agree.
- (11)**It don't belongs to Warsaw Pact.

The three times doesn't is used correctly appear to reflect idiomatic usage.

That is, the occurrences of doesn't + matter and doesn't + fit suggest memorized cooccurrence rather than productive usage. The third occurrence in sentence (5) is a literal translation of an idiom from Polish. However, his reason for translating the Polish idiom, 'It to me not costs' with the form doesn't is not clear. The type of usage demonstrated in sentences (3) through (5) is, though, different from that in (6) through (11). The latter have the potential to be used productively while the former are not as likely to be used outside of restricted constructions.

My informant used the past form of do-support, didn't, 9 times. All of the forms were contracted and all of the correct usages except one were in the first person singular:

- (12) I didn't finish.
- (13) I didn't took the Pontiac.
- (14) I didn't use German.
- (15) I didn't go for ski.
- (16)**I don't understand it. (Past form required by context)

The other casesⁱⁿ which the past tense form didn't should have been used were all third person plural:

- (17)**They don't occupy forests.
- (18)**They don't come still.
- (19)**They don't meet forces.
- (20) The Russian soldiers didn't come.

From these data it appears that the learner has analyzed the form don't as a specific lexical item which signals negation. It is not necessarily related to the form not. He does, however, realize that it is appropriate to use didn't for the past tense form of do in the first person singular.

In addition to the above use of do-support with negation, the learner produced two negative constructions which should have had do-support, but didn't:

- (21)**He even not have a relative.
- (22)**He even not have academic degree.

This type of error was predicted in the first section of the paper. With a student at the very low beginning level, one would expect more errors of this type. This learner has clearly learned the negative item don't, but still has to learn the proper distribution of the various forms of do + NEG.

There were fewer errors in the learner's use of be + NEG than in his use of do-support. He used the third person singular present tense is + not most frequently (27 times). Twelve of these negative constructions contained it as the grammatical subject:

- (23) It is not very liberal.
- (24) It is not important.
- (25) It is not necessary.

If the negative construction with it as subject contained too or so, words which imply negation (Klima, 1964), the learner contracted is with it:

- (26) It's not too bad.
- (27) It's not so very safety.
- (28) It's not so nice.
- (29) It's not so bad.

Many of the third person singular present tense forms were without any surface subject. It is possible that the phonological similarity between it's and is prevented me from hearing the utterance correctly, but I did listen closely for the voicing distinction. The learner had no trouble using the appropriate negative constructions in any of these cases.

There were eight other uses of present tense be + NEG forms. Three of them were with first person singular and always appeared with I and am contracted:

- (30) I'm not very sharp now.
- (31) I'm not a friend like other people.
- (32) I'm not going to hang a sword.

He used are correctly with second person and with third person plural

except for the following:

(33)**These groups is not easy to see.

The error in sentence (33) does not appear to be an indication of a systematic learning strategy, though.

The simple past tense form of be + NEG, was not, appeared 13 times. There were no errors in usage, and there was no contraction of was + not. First person singular was used five times and the remaining constructions were with it and this. There was only one attempt to use the plural past tense form:

(34)**Some parts was not understood.

The lack of usage of the plural past tense form be + NEG and the error made in the only attempt are good indications that the learner is avoiding the structure. He also consistently avoided using were in non-negative constructions. Polish has both a present and past tense form for the verb to be, but the only difference between the singular and plural past tense forms is a suffix indicating person, gender (in the singular), and number. There is no stem change as there is in English, and this may be the reason he avoided using were. Except for the apparent avoidance problem the learner has with the plural past tense form of be + NEG, the prediction that the category would be relatively easy for a Polish speaker learning English appears to be correct.

There are only ten negative constructions in my data which involve use of modal auxiliaries. The learner used cannot five times, couldn't three times and would + do + nothing once. There were no usage errors, and there was no alternation between contracted and non-contracted forms.

One of the most outstanding features in this learner's negation system is the systematic distribution of the full form not versus the

contracted form n't. This usage merits analysis because there are no exceptions in the learner's strategy in all of the data. Every usage of do + NEG is contracted and every usage of be + NEG is not contracted. Each of the two modal auxiliaries used shows a consistent form: can + NEG is never contracted and could + NEG is always contracted. It is apparent that his preference for one form over the other is not simply based on the phonological assimilation of the negation particle in Polish described earlier. It is possible that these items, i.e. don't, be + not, cannot and couldn't, are learned separately and only gradually, if at all, become part of a productive negation system.

In order to determine whether the learner errors and strategies described above are due to L₁ interference or developmental difficulties within the L₂, the results of the predicted learning problems have to be weighed against general linguistic development as is seen in children learning their first language. The influence of the learner's exposure to the target language must also be evaluated. Finally, the operation of linguistic universals in the acquisition of negation systems should be considered, although very little work outside of some investigations of universal tendencies in the acquisition of L₁ negation systems has been done (Wode, 1976).

My findings in the area of multiple negation problems in English are supported by data from longitudinal studies of the first language acquisition of English by children, by a longitudinal study of a child learning Russian as a native language, and by work on the cross-linguistic development of negation systems. On the basis of five longitudinal studies, I have found that children do not consistently use multiple negation in English.² Perhaps the best way to explain occurrences of multiple negation in children would^{be} to attribute it to idiosyncratic usage. This seems to vary greatly from speaker to speaker.

Gvozdev (1949) in a longitudinal study of his own child learning Russian as a native language, found that single negation preceded the adult model of multiple negation. One example cited is the following:

(35) Nyet nikavo. 'There is no one', ('Not no one')

which is rendered by the child as:

(36) Nyet kavo. (Slobin, 1966)

Wode (1976) proposed a theory designed to account for the acquisition of the early stages of negation in L₁. The languages included in his study

are English, German, Latvian, Swedish, Bulgarian, French, Dutch, Italian, Japanese, Egyptian Arabic, Polish, Russian, Finnish and Serbo-Croatian. His findings are hardly conclusive, but the direction of his study toward universals in the acquisition of negation is very attractive. He argues that children start with one-word negation regardless of native language. After a one-word system is established, they then develop a negation system appropriate to their native language.

It is possible that the nature of the negation acquisition task is such that the Polish-speaking informant found the single negation system in English easy to learn, and that this accounts for the low number of errors observed in his speech. Through his exposure to native speakers of English in a factory atmosphere, my informant most likely hears frequent multiple negation. Perhaps for the reasons outlined above, he is not influenced by negation usage in his daily environment. The developmental nature of his learning resists assimilating multiple negation. I would expect, however, that an analysis of his negation system at an earlier point of learning would have revealed more extensive transfer of multiple negation, but it is apparent that this problem was quickly overcome.

The learner's problems with do-support in negative constructions were predictable on the basis of language transfer to the extent that a new category in the target language should have presented some difficulty. The distribution of the forms, however, was not clearly predictable. The form don't is probably the form of do-support used most frequently in native English speech, and perhaps for that reason it was most salient to him. Although this learner is probably exposed to a high frequency of usage of don't instead of doesn't for third person singular where he works, I would argue that his usage is not based on what he hears, rather on the type of generalization he has made about the form don't. His use of don't instead of the past tense

form didn't supports this claim.

L₁ acquisition data on the use of do-support in negative constructions suggests that don't emerges in early negation as a monomorphemic negative which has a function similar to that of no and not. In their analysis of the acquisition of negation in children, Klima and Bellugi (1966) specify three periods in early negation. The first use of any form of do with negation is in "Period 2". Children use don't for all constructions regardless of person or tense. In "Period 3" didn't appears, but is used less often than don't. Bloom (1970), in what she calls "Phase II" negation, shows that children use don't most frequently for any type of do-support with a negative. One of the three children studied by her used doesn't and didn't as well, but not consistently in the appropriate grammatical situations. Bloom, in agreement with Bellugi (1967), observed that the different forms of the negative element don't, doesn't, can't were not transforms of do and can (Bloom, 1970, p. 195). She also contended that the forms can't, don't, and didn't are learned as alternants of the forms no and not (Bloom, 1970, p. 213). These findings are in accord with the usage demonstrated by my informant. I would argue that he has analyzed don't as a single unit which has the privileges of occurrence which show up in the data.

The native Polish speaker's use of the various forms of be + NEG and modal auxiliary + NEG is also similar to that observed in L₁ acquisition data. In both the Klima and Bellugi data and the Bloom data, there is no surface appearance of any form of be in a negative construction until late in "Period 2". All forms before that which should have contained be had only not or no:

- (37) That not lollipop.
- (38) That no Mommy.

The use of a surface form of be in negative constructions is optional throughout "Period 3" (Klima and Bellugi, 1966). The first surface forms to appear in these data were am/'m and was, which were also common forms in my informant's speech. All of the modal auxiliaries which appeared in these two studies (can't, couldn't and won't) were used in only the contracted form. In Bloom's data it's not was the first form of be + NEG observed. There were no contracted forms of not with be observed in either of the studies. The usage described in these studies appears to be quite similar to that observed in my informant. In some ways his system is more advanced, though. He uses is freely and without error in both contracted and non-contracted forms with it as subject. The main similarities lie in his infrequent use of are and his avoidance of were in negative constructions.

The most striking similarity observed in the L₁ development of negation and in my informant's system is the distribution of contracted versus non-contracted forms of not. As described earlier, my informant never contracted not with any form of be and always contracted it with forms of do. In a study designed to analyze the structural relationship between the full negative not and the contracted form n't, Maratsos, Kuczaj and Fox (1977) found that children consistently used n't with forms of do, and used not with forms of be. In a year's sample from a longitudinal study of one child, they found two occurrences of do not opposed to 752 uses of don't. In Bellugi (1967) and Bloom (1970) there are no instances of the full form not with any form of do. Maratsos, Kuczaj and Fox (1977) also looked at the same child's use of not with forms of be. They found that he always used the full form not until age 3, at which time two uses of wasn't appeared. In Bellugi (1967) and Bloom (1970) contraction of not with forms of be was also rare.

In order to determine the similarity of parental usage to that observed in the child, Maratsos, Kuczaj and Fox (1977) did extensive taping of parental speech. They found that the child's consistent usage of don't closely matched parental usage, but that his usage of be + NEG was very different from that of the parents until he reached age 3;4. He frequently used is not and are not, but never used isn't and aren't. There were several uses of was not and were not, but no contracted forms until two of them appeared at age 3. These data suggest that the child has not analyzed not and n't and is unable to generalize their relationship until reaching a certain stage in development.

The question of whether my informant is exposed to extensive contraction of not in his everyday environment cannot be answered at this time. I am not aware of any studies on the distributional frequencies of the contracted versus the non-contracted form of not in English either. Klima (1964) says that contraction of not is optional in most grammatical situations. He also says that certain contracted forms "seem to be more frequent in informal speech" (Klima and Bellugi, 1966, p.337). On the basis of my own observations, I would contend that not is generally contracted with modal auxiliaries and forms of do in informal speech. It isn't clear whether not with present tense forms of be is more often contracted than not:

- (39) He isn't happy/ he's not happy.
- (40) We aren't happy/ we're not happy.

The past forms of be + not do not allow the two types of contraction observed in (39) and (40), and because of this, provide a useful source of testing learner generalizations. My informant consistently used the full form of not in these cases when most native speakers would probably use the contracted form. However difficult it may be to specify a norm for usage, I contend that my informant's usage shows that he has not generalized the relationship between not and n't.

Once a learning strategy like that described above has been detected, the next task is to determine what the overall implications of the strategy on the second language learning process are. The obvious options in this case for the language teacher are either to leave the learner alone in order to allow his negation system to develop as it would in the child's L₁ system or to draw the learner's attention to the developmental system and try to help him make generalizations about his system. If the teacher takes the first option, there is the possibility that the learner's negation system will not continue to develop in the same way that the child's system does. There may be other learning factors involved with both systems. It is possible that the development of the second language learner's negation system will be slow compared to other linguistic systems in the L₂ if steps are not taken to speed up development. Restricted usage of certain forms, especially in adult second language learners, can often lead to 'fossilization' of these forms. The danger, in this case, is that development will just stop, and that the learner will make do with the limited forms at his disposal. If this does happen, productive usage of the system based on generalization will not be possible. The learner will not be able to say exactly what he wants to in certain situations. He will systematically avoid certain forms and structures to the detriment of his fluency in the language he is trying to learn.

On the other hand, the teacher could choose to focus the learner's attention on his incomplete negation system in order to increase the productivity of the system. In doing this, one of the first steps would be to make the learner aware of the fact that don't, doesn't and didn't are all forms of do-support plus the negative particle not. I am not suggesting that the teacher encourage the learner to actively use do not, does not and did not, but an awareness that the contracted forms with do-support are actually the same

as those used with the forms of be + not should help the learner see that there is a general underlying uniformity in the English negation system. This, in turn, should help him move toward the adult model of negation.

In teaching this problem, I would also recommend moving the focus in grammar exercises from the more common form don't to the forms doesn't and didn't. It is apparent that this learner has good control of how do-support is supposed to work in negative constructions, but he has to learn the appropriate distribution of the equivalent forms doesn't and didn't. This is especially obvious with didn't in third person plural usage. I would encourage contraction of not when it is used in constructions with be, especially in the past tense forms. The usage with the present tense forms which can involve two different and optional types of contraction would be more difficult to present in a clearly focused manner. One of the main points in this would be to make the learner aware of the connection between do + not and be + not. This awareness along with increased practice of the most often avoided forms would be a positive step toward developing native-speaker competence in the English negation system.

FOOTNOTES

1

The data used in this analysis were gathered from one native speaker of Polish from the Kracow area of Poland. He is at the beginning level in the English Language Program for International Students at the University of Minnesota. He attends English classes in the mornings and works five hours every afternoon in a factory. A four-hour conversation between the informant and me was taped and then analyzed for uses of negative constructions. My aim in gathering the data was to make the situation as naturalistic as possible. I guided the conversation and tried to get the informant deeply involved with the subject matter. In order to increase the frequency of negative constructions, I often took a contrary point of view or made statements which elicited immediate and animated responses.

2

In addition to examining longitudinal acquisition studies, I consulted with Michael Maratsos in the Child Psychology department about his experience with multiple negation in children learning English as a first language. He has seen no clear developmental stage in acquisition of English in which children consistently use multiple markers of negation.

REFERENCES

- Bellugi, U. 1967. The acquisition of negation. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- Bloom, L. 1970. Language development: form and function in emerging grammars. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
- Cygan, J. 1973. Negation in English and Polish. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 2.295-329.
- Dulay H.C. and M.K. Burt. 1972. You can't learn without goofing: an analysis of children's second language errors. In J. Richards (ed.) *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition*, 95-123. London: Longman.
- Klima, E.S. 1964. Negation in English. In J.J. Fodor and J.A. Katz (eds.) *The structure of language: readings in the philosophy of language*, 246-323. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Klima, E.S. and U. Bellugi. 1966. Syntactic regularities in the speech of children. In C.A. Ferguson and D.I. Slobin (eds.) *Studies of child language development*, 333-353. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Maratsos, M., S. Kuczaj and D. Fox. 1977. Some empirical studies on the acquisition of transformational relations: passives, negatives and the past tense. Paper presented at the Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Schenker, A.M. 1973. *Beginning Polish*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Slobin, D.I. 1966. The acquisition of Russian as a native language. In F. Smith and G.A. Miller (eds.) *The genesis of language: a psycholinguistic approach*, 129-47. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
- Stockwell, R.P. and J.D. Bowen. 1965. *The sounds of English and Spanish*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wode, H. 1976. Four early stages in the development of L₁ negation. *Journal of Child Language*, 4.1.87-102.